

REMARKS

Status of Claims

Claims 18, 47 and 54 are amended. No new matter is added. Claims 56-58 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, claims 18, 20, 22-27, 47, 49 are 54 are pending in the application. A detailed listing of all claims that are in the application, is presented, with appropriately defined status identifiers.

Independent claim 18 is amended to recite subject matter previously recited in now-cancelled claim 56. Similarly, independent claims 47 and 54 are amended to subject matter previously recited in now-cancelled claims 57 and 58, respectively.

As such, the amendments to claims 18, 47 and 54 do not raise new issues that would require a new search. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this Amendment be entered.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103

In paragraph 5 of the Office action, claims 18, 20, 22-26, 47, 49 and 54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Somasundaram et al. (“Somasundaram,” U.S. Patent No. 7,334,049).

In paragraph 15 of the Office action, claim 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Somasundaram and further in view of Inoue et al. (“Inoue,” U.S. Patent No. 7,103,663).

In paragraph 17 of the Office action, claims 56-58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Somasundaram and further in view of Guan et al. (“Guan,” U.S. Patent No. 7,334,048).

As previously noted, claims 56-58 are canceled. Therefore, the rejection of these claims is rendered moot.

The rejection of claims 18, 20, 22-27, 47, 49 are 54 is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 18

As amended, independent claim 18 recites: a packet transfer device comprising:

a DNS proxy unit for receiving a name resolution response message transmitted from a name resolution server to said client, said name resolution response message including an IP address corresponding to said destination and one or more packet transfer information fields, and for rewriting a routing table of said DNS proxy unit to include said IP address and said one or more packet transfer information fields,

wherein said DNS proxy unit is configured to control said transfer of the packets between said client and said destination according to said one or more packet transfer information fields,

wherein said one or more packet transfer information fields include at least one of a packet transfer priority field, a logical network identifier, and a logical channel identifier, and

wherein said one or more packet transfer information fields include the packet transfer priority field. (Emphasis Added).

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 18 is patentable over the cited references.

Regarding claims 56-58, in paragraph 18 of the Office action, the Examiner acknowledges that “Somasundaram does not expressly teach utilizing a priority field in the routing information.”

However, the Examiner cites Guan as supplying features acknowledged to be missing from Somasundaram. In addition, the Examiner proposes combining the two references to arrive at Applicants’ claimed embodiment. Further, the Examiner summarily states: “It would be advantageous for an address translator such as that taught by Somasundaram to have a priority field in addition to other routing fields as Guan’s does, as priority is a well known routing function.” (Office action, page 8, paragraph 18.)

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s contentions.

Even assuming, for the sake of argument, that Guan discloses or suggests “. . . wherein said one or more packet transfer information fields include the packet transfer priority field” and/or that “priority is a well known routing function,” Applicants respectfully

submit that the Office action does not describe or provide a sufficient reason to combine the teachings of Somasundaram and Guan in the manner proposed. That is, in merely stating that “priority is a well known routing function,” the Examiner does not describe or provide a sufficiently detailed reason why one skilled in the art would combine the cited references in the manner proposed.

At least for the reasons explained, it is believed that claim 18 is patentable over the cited art.

Claims 20 and 22-27 depend from claim 1. At least for this reason, it is believed that claims 20 and 22-27 are patentable over the cited art.

Dependent Claim 22

Further, dependent claim 22 recites the packet transfer device as set forth in claim 18, further comprising:

a user information obtaining unit which obtains attribute information regarding a sender of a name resolution request message transmitted from said client to said name resolution server, wherein

said DNS proxy unit, upon receiving said name resolution request message, obtains said attribute information regarding the sender of said name resolution request message through said user information obtaining unit and transmits said name resolution request message with said attribute information added to said name resolution server. (Emphasis Added.)

Regarding claim 22, in paragraph 8 of the Office action, the Examiner contends that Somasundaram discloses “a user information obtaining unit which obtains attribute information regarding a sender[.]”

Here, the Examiner cites Somasundaram, col. 7, lines 31-47, as disclosing “the NAT receives the DNS request from the Host, which reveals its private address, which is replaced with a source address from the NAT pool.” (Office action, page 5, paragraph 8.)

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s contentions.

The Examiner apparently equates the “private address” of the Host, as described in Somasundaram, with the “attribute information” of claim 22. Applicants respectfully submit that those skilled in the art would not reasonably interpret “attribute information” of a sender to include the “private address” of a host. Rather, a “private address” would be understood as the address of the host within a private domain. As such an address, the “private address” of a host, as described in Somasundaram and cited in the Office action, does not constitute a type of “attribute information.”

Because Somasundaram does not disclose or suggest “obtain[ing] attribute information of a sender,” Somasundaram does not disclose or suggest “a user information obtaining unit which obtains attribute information regarding a sender of a name resolution request message transmitted from said client to said name resolution server[,],” as recited in claim 22.

Because Somasundaram does not disclose or suggest “a user information obtaining unit which obtains attribute information regarding a sender[,],” Somasundaram does not disclose or suggest “said DNS proxy unit, upon receiving said name resolution request message, obtains said attribute information . . . through said user information obtaining unit and transmits said name resolution request message with said attribute information added to said name resolution server[,],” as also recited in claim 22.

At least for the reasons explained, it is believed that claim 22 is further patentable over the cited art.

Claims 23-27 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 22. At least for this reason, it is believed that claims 23-27 are further patentable over the cited art.

Independent Claims 47 and 54

As amended, independent claim 47 recites a computer-readable storage medium storing computer-readable instructions, said computer-readable instructions configured to cause a computing device to:

perform a proxy function of receiving a name resolution response message transmitted from a name resolution server to a client, said name resolution response message including an IP address according to a destination and one or more packet transfer information fields, and rewriting a routing table to include said IP address and said one or more packet transfer information fields; and

control a transfer of a plurality of packets between said client and said destination according to said one or more packet transfer information fields,

wherein said one or more packet transfer information fields include at least one of a packet transfer priority field, a logical network identifier, and a logical channel identifier, and

wherein said one or more packet transfer information fields include the packet transfer priority field.

As amended, independent claim 54 recites a packet transfer method of transferring a plurality of packets between a client and a destination, said method comprising:

receiving a name resolution response message transmitted from a name resolution server to said client, said name resolution response message including an IP address corresponding to said destination and one or more packet transfer information fields;

rewriting a routing table to include said IP address and said one or more packet transfer information fields; and

controlling said transfer of said packets between said client and said destination according to said IP address and said one or more packet transfer information fields,

wherein said one or more packet transfer information fields include at least one of a packet transfer priority field, a logical network identifier, and a logical channel identifier, and

wherein said one or more packet transfer information fields include the packet transfer priority field.

At least for reasons similar to those explained with respect to claim 18, it is believed that independent claims 47 and 54 are patentable over the cited art.

Claim 49 depends from claim 47. At least for this reason, it is believed that claim 49 is patentable over the cited art.

Concluding Remarks

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by the credit card payment instructions in EFS-Web being incorrect or absent, resulting in a rejected or incorrect credit card transaction, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 1/12/09

By Norman (Reg. No. 58,941)

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6014
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

for

George C. Beck
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,072